

### III

#### SOME DYNAMICS OF ADVANCE

“WE must wage peace as men have hitherto waged war.” So spoke President Hoover some fifteen years ago. Such words spoken in peace time received polite applause. But we have never waged peace with a fraction of the energy, organization, or sacrifice which we have devoted to war. It has been well said that the history of the race has been an alternation between periods in which men are soldiers and those in which they are playboys. When a war is over, men relax into self-indulgence until society drifts into an impasse where war seems inevitable and then they discipline themselves again into being soldiers. Thus the vicious circle has continued down the generations. It will be broken only when we apply ourselves to the task of peacemaking with a zeal comparable to that given to war.

If we are to wage peace as men have hitherto waged war, we must take over into the peace movement certain central concepts which have been largely monopolized by war.

##### I. PATRIOTISM

The first of these is Patriotism. Consider a moment how largely the idea of patriotism has been colored by war. When we speak of a great patriot, the thought of military heroism flashes into our minds. When we stage a patriotic celebration we usually do so with military accoutrements. The occasions for patriotic celebrations are generally events commemorative of military victories.

During war, patriotism is a thrilling sentiment. We erect our war posters picturing America as a woman attacked. We personify America as a Mother. We speak of her honor, her safety, her glory. Then when peace comes we pull down the posters. We depersonalize our Mother Country into the government. We change the pronoun from "her" to "its," and the adjectives which we use depend somewhat on our politics.

The question is, can we keep the color and zeal in patriotism during peace as well as during war? Patriotism is one of our noblest emotions. It lifts a person out of his little egoism and loses him in something larger than himself. It stirs the spirit of nobility and sacrifice within him. It reveals to him the paradoxical principle of life that a man gets what belongs to him only as he has a sense of belonging. The way to world peace comes through a development of patriotism rather than through its destruction.

But can love of country be fostered without deteriorating into that narrow nationalism which has been so hideously divisive? The last twenty-five years have witnessed the revival of nationalism in all the principal countries.

In 1917, Russia renounced her policy of imitating other cultures. She said, "Why should we continue to take our patterns of aristocracy from Prussia, our models of literature from France, and our forms of worship from Byzantium? What have we that is truly Russian?" And she chose the sickle, the symbol of the peasant, and the hammer, the symbol of the artisan. She crossed these two symbols of her heritage, and under the banner of that hammer and sickle Russia has manifested a revival of energy and a military might which have amazed the world.

Italy illustrated another revival of nationalism. After flirting with liberal doctrines, Italy was led by Mussolini

back to the Augustan glories. Determined to show the world that Italy had a unique and glorious heritage, the pompous little Mussolini sought to revive the glamor of the Caesars. He even devised a calendar dating from ancient Rome. Of course, he is not reckoning time by that calendar now! But Fascism drew its strength from soil fertilized by the memories of Italy's rich past.

Germany demonstrated a similar reawakening. Groping up out of defeat after it was "all quiet on the western front," the disheartened and disillusioned German youth could not find "the road back." Then arose the fanatical Hitler, to convince them that they had something which even their conquerors did not possess. They had a superior Nordic race. By deifying their Nordic blood, the Nazi party started Germany on a road of racial persecution and brutal aggressiveness which led to the abyss of war.

Japan, clever copyist of things western, began to say, "Why should we take all our patterns from the proud white race? We have an imperial house, divine in origin and antedating the Christian era." Thus Japan launched herself upon the mission of making her emperor, descended from the sun-goddess, the creator and ruler of a new order in the Orient.

And we in the United States have had our revival of "the American Way." That expression has been splashed over the minds of our citizenry. A survey of the publications of the last two decades would show years in which a single season's books covered almost every panel of the American scene. This reappraisal of the American heritage is an emphasis devoutly to be desired, provided it gets us back to the true principles of our Founding Fathers. One way to lift our brash "hundred percent Americanism" into a passing grade of Christian Americanism is to steep ourselves in the original

intentions of our national institutions. One tendency which has led us astray is that instead of getting back to the original sources in order to see where we ought to go, we have kept our ears to the ground to hear the hoof-beats of the next Gallup poll in order to see where the crowd is going.

It is as justifiable for us to think of our national inheritance as it was for the Jewish people to think of theirs. The God of Abraham and of Isaac and of Jacob was also the God of our national Fathers. We do not think of the God and Father of all mankind as playing favorites with any nation. We believe God is no respecter of persons; but the fathers who founded this nation were respecters of God. The mere explorers who came to this new world looking for gold did not stay long. The traders who sought quick profits from furs did little to fashion the framework of our American society. The real building of our permanent American inheritance began with those settlers whose spirit is expressed in the Mayflower Compact. That document expressly states that the voyage had been undertaken for "the glory of God, the advancement of the Christian faith, and the honor of King and country."

The religious motives of the American colonists were of course not unmixed with commercial interests. The settlers were not saints, even though some of them bore the name of Puritans. The treatment of the Indians has some very dark chapters. But, by and large, the founders of American society were a God-fearing people, and they looked upon their new homes as veritably God-given. The Pilgrims in New England, the Quakers in Pennsylvania, the Anglicans and Dutch Reformed in New York, the Roman Catholics in Maryland, the Huguenots in the Carolinas—those and others were sufficiently religious to realize that back of the royal arms which they emblazoned on their settlements, the real title of owner-

ship rested in a Higher, a divine Power. In a very true sense, this land was to them God's world.

And on this land the American Fathers established a form of government. There were not many successful models of democracy to guide our constitution-makers. A little struggling decadent republic in Poland and weak semblances of democracy in Venice and the Netherlands were about all the contemporary patterns they had. When one thinks of the few models, the meager materials, and the disturbed state of the world at that time, the creation of the United States seems almost a miracle. Is it sentimental to say that our Founding Fathers felt the hand of God? Well, we remember the words of Benjamin Franklin, who probably would have been considered one of the least religiously orthodox of his day. It was the aged Franklin who moved that the sessions of the Constitutional Convention be opened with prayer. In doing so he uttered these oft-quoted words: "I have lived, Sir, a long time, and the longer I live the more convincing proofs I see of this truth, that God governs in the affairs of men. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without his notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without his aid?" That sense of the divine dependence voiced by Franklin may, during the century and a half since, have at times grown dim, but it has never disappeared from the councils of our government.

And then on this land and under our form of government our fathers have evolved what we call "the American way of life." We hear increasingly this expression "The American Way." Far be it from me to attempt any adequate definition of it in this brief message. But some essentials do seem clear. The American way of life is that wherein every person at birth is endowed with the right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, which rights he is to exercise subject to

those social regulations necessary to insure the same privileges to others. The American way of life is one wherein all men are equal before God and the government, not of course equal in ability, but each one good enough to have a say in deciding which is the best. It is a way wherein through taxation *with* representation we join in doing together what we cannot do privately, thereby promoting the general welfare. It is a way wherein the majority rules, yet accords every minority the right to promote its views by the peaceful arts of persuasion. The American way is one wherein each person enjoys the right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience. It is a way of life wherein parents are still free to educate their children without the regimentation of any dictator and where boys and girls are still free to plan their careers and dream their dreams without the intervention of any tyrant.

As our minds go back to the sources of the American way of life, we find welling up in our hearts a cleansing and strengthening sense of gratitude. Dean Inge in a farewell sermon at Cambridge said: "Believe me, the only promise of a better future for our country is to be looked for from those to whom her past is dear." What is true for Britain is true for America. Such gratitude humbles us with a sense of indebtedness. On one occasion some students at Williams College defaced one of the campus properties. About to be apprehended, the guilty boys went to President Mark Hopkins, pulled out their purses and offered to pay the damage. Being sons of wealth they treated such a solution as an easy way out of their predicament. But Hopkins sternly ordered them to put up their pocketbooks and make a public apology in chapel the following morning. At that chapel exercise Mark Hopkins made a speech to the students in which he reminded them that they were not paying their way through

college, that the sacrifices of the college founders and the meagerly paid services of the faithful professors had put them in debt far beyond their power of reimbursement. Any man worthy the name of gentleman is humbled and stirred by the thought of the price paid for his privileges. It makes a fundamental difference in our civic attitudes whether we have a creditor complex or a debtor complex, whether we are thinking how much others owe us, or how much we owe to others. Chesterton painted the truth when he said: "He who is conscious of a debt he can never pay will be forever paying it."

Harvard College sends her graduates out at each commencement with a baccalaureate hymn which breathes this spirit of gratitude for our national heritage:

Let children learn the mighty deeds  
Which God performed of old,  
Which in our youngest years we saw,  
And which our fathers told.  
Our lips shall tell them to our sons,  
And they again to theirs,  
That generations yet unborn  
May teach them to their heirs.

The reappraisal of our national heritage not only deepens our sense of indebtedness for our rights but also clarifies our conception of right. When we see that the sovereignty of God was the foundation principle on which our American philosophy of life was founded, we realize that our nation's moral sanctions rest in something deeper than expediency. Eve Curie tells of interviewing the first batch of German prisoners captured by the Russians. She asked them if they thought their Fuehrer was right when he invaded Poland. They answered "Yes." She asked them if they thought the Fuehrer was right when he invaded France. They answered "Yes." Then she asked, "Do you think Hitler was right

when he attacked Russia?" Being prisoners of the Russians, the disheveled Germans were a bit hesitant and finally admitted that they guessed their Fuehrer had made a mistake in invading Russia. From this conversation Eve Curie distilled the conclusion that in the Nazi philosophy the only criterion of right is, does it succeed? If a thing seems to succeed, it is held to be right. This is not the American philosophy of life or government. Both our individual rights and our ideas of right are limned in clearer light when we look back to the sources of our national life.

When we re-study our national heritage we are broadened as well as humbled. We are made mindful that the ideals, the arts, the sciences, the humanities which constitute our national culture are derived from sources far beyond our own borders. If we are thinking of origins, there is no more "a hundred percent Americanism" than there is a hundred percent automobile. The materials which go into the making of our motor cars come from the ends of the earth; and so do the elements which compose our culture. Into this land have poured the most varied racial streams, carrying with them rich contributions which have given color to our common life. Our speech may have an American accent, but our language came from England, and there it developed as a blend of several strains. We in America have profited by French refinement and Irish wit, by Scandinavian sturdiness and by Negro willingness to sing and bear burdens. The radio which we use sprang from the mind of an Italian, and the programs which it carries even in war time are the compositions of Germans like Bach and Wagner. Look through our hymnals and see whence came the favorite hymns by which our spirits are wafted God-ward from churches built in the name of Jesus Christ, a Jew. There is no Nazi chemistry nor English mathematics, no Japanese electricity nor dis-



tinctly Jewish heartache. Our national and racial lines of division are little fences which art and science, truth and beauty completely overleap.

As we contemplate the rich and varied strains of our national heritage, the thought is borne in upon us that to most of us all these blessings have come through the mere accident of birth. These things are ours because we were born here. And that thought should call to our minds the millions of others, equally deserving, who look longingly toward these shores. Personally I recall two splendid young men whom I met some years ago in Prague. They had the character qualifications of American citizenship. They had our longing for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. How they burned with the desire to escape from their shadowed City of Prague and try their powers in this land of opportunity. But the war cut off their hopes. Where are they now? The memory of those two young men stings me awake to my God-given privileges. I am proud to be an American, but the thought of such men mellows my pride with humility.

Furthermore, when we realize the price paid for our American way of life and the multitudes who crave the right to share it, we are moved to dedicate ourselves to the high duty of safeguarding our national inheritance from the influences which would waste it—from any exploitation of the land which would leave it poorer, from any intolerance which would divide our citizens, from any injustices which would oppress the poor, from any subversive doctrines which would undermine our democratic principles, from any godlessness which would debase our institutions or demean our people.

Recently I visited our national capital. Washington in many ways is the most vivid symbol of the current tension and strain. As one resident said whimsically, "We hope

Washington will not be bombed because it would disturb the confusion!" One evening, after the city had quieted down for its dinner hour, I walked to the head of Pennsylvania Avenue near the White House and looked down over the city toward the capitol. There I saw its massive dome rising above the gaunt naked trees. Strength seemed to radiate from its very size. Then my eye moved to the tall stately shaft of the Washington Monument, symbolizing in its glistening height the aristocracy of character which was in our first president. His loftiness of mind, his integrity of purpose, his magnanimity of spirit came to mind as I thought of him in those turbulent days when he nailed his personal fortunes alongside the ragged colors of a perilous cause. Then my gaze swung a little further to the right until it took in that solid symmetrical memorial erected to Lincoln, who "with malice toward none and with charity for all" kept faith in the American way of life during the crisis of war between the states. As my imagination played over America's past, I felt a new birth of patriotic fervor, not a narrow nationalistic pride but a humbling sense of personal indebtedness and a sobering sense of the high mission expected of a nation so favored.

## II. PROPAGANDA

Propaganda, like patriotism, has hitherto been the ally of the war-makers. It has been far more effective in the fomenting of fear and hatred than in the generating of good will. One great newspaper some time ago admitted that propaganda required hostile emotions to spur it. We in New York City could fill Madison Square Garden, our largest auditorium, every night in the week for a fortnight if we were to organize "anti" meetings, meetings of protest against some nation, some race, some "ism." But meetings for Chinese relief or starving Greeks require the most artificial stimulations to get even a modest audience.

It would seem that our fears and angers are more easily kindled than our loves. The question is, can we take propaganda over into the peace movement? Can we use it as a uniting, as well as a dividing instrument? Or can we beget the spirit of unity within groups without playing on the fear of other groups? The ancient tribe stressed the fear of other tribes in order to hold the loyalty of its members. When the Roman Republic was struggling to establish itself against its surrounding enemies, it developed an intense devotion on the part of its citizenry; when the Roman Empire became sole master of the Mediterranean world its domestic ties loosened and its loyalties disintegrated. Political parties within nations have depended on the motives of rivalry and fear to hold their members. At a certain juncture in the life of the struggling French Republic, Jules Simon, one of the leaders of the Republican party, was deeply concerned over the disintegrating tendencies within the party. How could he quicken it into united action? (Please understand that I am talking about the Republican Party in France, not in the United States! I have no solution at the moment for its problems!) A politician came into Simon's office with the suggestion that there was always one way of uniting the Republicans and that was to take a big crack at the clericals. So it has been with the partisan spirit. The way to stir loyalty to a party is to arouse fear of a rival. And this principle has even pervaded the precincts of religious groups. Sectarian groups have stirred the most fanatical loyalty by playing up the fears of rival sects.

If we can find no way of developing loyalty except through fear and hatred of others, then the vicious circles of strife within nations and between nations will go on. Recently I asked a distinguished Roman Catholic if he could see any hope of changing this traditional technique. He suggested

that I make a study of Saint Francis. It is eminently worth remembering that Saint Francis lived in the time of the Crusades. And in the contrast between the saint and the leaders of the Crusades may be seen an epitome of the choice which confronts our post-war generation. The Crusaders aroused Europe to a frenzy of hatred against the Moslems who held the Holy City, and in the effort to rescue the Holy Sepulchre from the hated infidel they decimated the homes of Europe even of their children and they drenched the hills of Palestine with the blood of both Christians and Moslems. Saint Francis, on the other hand, contemplated the love of Christ until he caught the glow of his spirit, which he went about radiating. The quiet saint of Assisi did not have the spectacular arousing power of Peter the Hermit, but his radiance lasted longer. In fact the glow of his godliness has been so enduring that a book based on his life, *Blessed Are the Meek*, is a current best-seller.

Yes, propaganda for brotherhood can be effective if we set ourselves to it assiduously. Charitableness, like charity, must begin at home. Good will requires grace of action to be effective. Friendly racial, religious, and national attitudes are hindered by awkwardness of application as much as by lack of good intention. Men may be committed to the theory of tolerance and yet most inept in showing the spirit of fellowship. Take it in the case of anti-Semitism. The violent outspoken anti-Semite is revolting to cultured people. But how many persons there are who would fight to protect the Jews' civil rights and yet are lumbering and clumsy in their relations to the Jew. They may be free from conscious malice; nevertheless they fail either to cultivate or feel the need of genuine talent in the art of neighborly day-by-day living. They are not sensitive, not intuitively understanding and gracious. They are outwardly kind to Jews, but only

because of the practical discipline of memory, plus a sense of expediency. They are tolerant only because of political axioms they have heard and like to mouth when they have an audience. They are often patronizing in their tolerance, and their good will is a synthetic product, not a delicate flowering of the human spirit. For that delicate natural flowering of good will the home is the best, the almost indispensable soil. The experiences of the playground, the contacts of school, the news of the world broadcast into our living rooms—these all become material for distilling good will in the alembic of the well-run home.

The school offers a second sounding board for the propaganda of good will. What can be done through the public schools has been shown by an experiment tried in Springfield, Massachusetts. In this typical middle-sized conservative community, about forty percent are of old Yankee stock and the rest are chiefly of Polish, Irish, and French-Canadian descent with the usual Jewish and Negro minority groups. Some sixty percent are Roman Catholic. In the fall of 1939, the superintendent of schools appointed a committee of school executives and teachers to plan a campaign against prejudice and intolerance. Seeking to reach all educational levels, the program included adult education and teacher training.

The committee held that the teaching of democracy had hitherto been too much idealized. Youth had been told that America was a perfect democracy, but they became disillusioned when the realities of their experience failed to coincide with these ideals. The Negro girl, for instance, knew she might be the best stenographer in the class but that she would have the hardest time getting a job. The boy with the foreign name knew that he could not compete on equal terms with boys of Anglo-Saxon stock. The Committee, therefore,

tried to face situations frankly. It would lay bare the weaknesses in our democratic system and seek measures to correct them.

The Springfield approach proceeded on the principle that the educational work of combating intolerance and divisiveness must be gradual, inconspicuous, and always constructive. Openly publicized counter-propaganda so frequently fails because it focuses attention with suggestive force on the very ills it seeks to cure. The four steps developed in the schools with appropriate activities and materials were: Getting axioms of decency and fair play into the minds of the children; emphasizing the difference between fact and opinion; stressing the importance of getting the relevant facts in a situation before making a judgment; and, with these facts in hand, making judgments in terms of decency, honesty, and fair play.

The testimony of experience is that "the Springfield Plan" has worked with significant results.

Religious agencies, along with the home and the school, have now an unprecedented opportunity to further the propaganda of good will. When we consider the modern means of global communication, we realize the present challenge given to the original commission of the Christian church, "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations." The new openings for world fellowship may serve to close some of the divisions within domestic religious bodies. We may be shamed out of our petty parochialism. Cynics often say that if you wish to see how Christians love one another you have only to watch how they fight among themselves. But boys from our home churches are now getting glimpses of the greatness of the Christian program. An American soldier recently wrote a letter home from the Fiji Islands. He and a comrade had been out walking one Sunday afternoon. They met a couple

of Fiji Islanders dressed in native costume which was quite primitive and pretty diminutive. To the American lads the natives looked strange and wild. But when the boys stopped to make some signs to them, they were greatly surprised to find that the Fijians spoke good English. Their surprise was heightened still further when the natives invited them to church. And the American soldier's letter added, "Mother, would you believe it, they weren't cannibals, they were Methodists, too."

The discovery made by those two American boys is being duplicated times beyond number. Men who may not have thought much about the church at home are feeling a new sense of fellowship in it as they find how far the gospel of Christ has begotten a loyalty to him. Fliers put down in the South Pacific have been fed and nursed by fuzzy-haired natives whose grandfathers were cannibals. Soldiers in the jungles of Burma have been treated by finely-trained missionary doctors whom they found there. Our soldiers and citizens have found in China, as did Mr. Willkie, "reservoirs of good will" developed there by devoted Christian workers. In the thrill which surged through America on the occasion of Mme. Chiang Kai Shek's visit, our citizenry saw vividly the results of a century of missionary cultivation.

The Christian church, though a minority group, will be the best coordinated international force when the guns of this war cease firing. Reports coming through neutral Switzerland indicate that nuclei of Christians in Germany are waiting for the cessation of open hostilities in order to renew the broken links of church fellowship across the battle zones. The church of Christ gives promise of being the most potent agency in starting the propaganda of brotherhood.

While current publicity is being given to statements emanating from high places that "the only good Jap is a dead

Jap," the church is keeping alive the hope of renewing missionary hands between America and Japan. And that hope is sanctioned by secular voices which have the right to be heard. Ambassador Grew, whose judgment on this issue merits more respect than perhaps that of any other public man, has said: "It was not the Christians of Japan who brought on this terrible war, but the military leaders who profess faith only in themselves and their military schemes. . . . Christianity is deep-rooted in Japan. I do not believe that it can ever be crushed, and when the war is over and the military clique is no longer in power there, it is my conviction that a great opportunity and responsibility will again be offered the churches."

And alongside the home, the school, and the church, government agencies of the so-called Christian nations can align themselves as channels of friendly propaganda. When the war is over the Office of War Information should be replaced by the Office of Peace Information, whose functions would be to foster friendly relations between nations through press bureaus, academic exchanges, travel, study, conventions, and the like. While it is true that within sixty hours an airplane can reach the most distant point on the globe, the man on the street is not the man in the plane. International understanding must be democratized. The peace movement needs a service rendered for it similar to that which the Salvation Army did for religion some years ago. The Salvation Army brought religion down to the street level. Peace propaganda must be brought down from the realm of academic discussion to the country store, the curbstone, and the dinner table.

Diplomacy must become missionary-minded if peace is to get into the thinking of the people. There must be a change in the governmental attitude of treating missionaries as minor nuisances and futile dreamers. If our own State De-



partment would wake up to discover how much the nationals in South America, for instance, welcomed the teachers and doctors sent there by our Protestant churches, there would be a new consideration for these religious ambassadors of good will.

One of our veteran missionary statesmen has said that if American churches a generation ago had spent a sum equivalent to the cost of a single modern battleship in cultivating the Japanese people, the relations with Japan might never have reached their present tragic denouement. It is a conjecture worth considering. Recently in the press appeared the estimate that the present war up to date had cost the involved nations one trillion dollars. The thought will not down that even a small fraction of such an outlay spent in the cultivation of good will would avert these recurring disasters of war.

### III. PREPAREDNESS

Like patriotism and propaganda, the word preparedness is colored by war. It suggests armies, navies, aircraft, material.

If we believe in our American way of life, we of course desire to be prepared to preserve its ideals, its institutions, its rights and privileges. And after the experiences of the last two years, we are not likely to disarm and leave ourselves at the mercy of lawless nations. In a world of such unruly elements as now exist, we cannot dispense with all instruments of force. The present mood, as expressed by public officials and Gallup polls, makes talk of post-war disarmament futile.

But we must cling to the distinction between force exercised in a spirit of hatred and revenge by nations, each regarding itself as sovereign, and force exercised in a spirit of impartial justice for the purpose not of destroying enemies but of preserving order. The first is the present war system; the second

is the principle of international police force. Can the world community transform the principle of coercion from the war system to police force? That hope, cherished before the war, has been dimmed by the events of the last decade. But it must not be allowed to fade out. It must be revived. Differences in standards of living, differences in moral sanctions, national self-preservation in crises, the moot question of sovereignty—all these seem to create obstacles which might appear insufferable.

Religious leaders, however, cling to the conviction that international organization and police can supplant the war system. A few months ago a hundred and fifty churchmen, holding the most responsible official positions of leadership in the three faiths, Roman Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish, drew up a Declaration on World Peace. There are seven points in the Pattern for Peace, which constitutes the most significant pronouncement on Peace so far to emanate from religious bodies. The planks are as follows:

1. The Moral Law Must Govern World Order—The organization of a just peace depends upon practical recognition of the fact that not only individuals but nations, states, and international society are subject to the sovereignty of God and to the moral law which comes from God.

2. The Rights of the Individual Must Be Assured—The dignity of the human person as the image of God must be set forth in all its essential implications in an international declaration of rights and be vindicated by the positive action of national governments and international organization. States as well as individuals must repudiate racial, religious, or other discrimination in violation of those rights.

3. The Rights of Oppressed, Weak, or Colonial Peoples Must Be Protected—The rights of all peoples, large and small, subject to the good of the organized world community,

must be safeguarded within the framework of collective security. The progress of undeveloped, colonial, or oppressed peoples toward political responsibility must be the object of international concern.

4. The Rights of Minorities must be Secured—National governments and international organization must respect and guarantee the rights of ethnic, religious, and cultural minorities to economic livelihood, to equal opportunity for educational and cultural development, and to political equality.

5. International Institutions to Maintain Peace with Justice Must Be Organized—An enduring peace requires the organization of international institutions which will develop a body of international law; guarantee the faithful fulfilment of international obligations, and revise them when necessary; assure collective security by drastic limitation and continuing control of armaments, compulsory arbitration and adjudication of controversies, and the use when necessary of adequate sanctions to enforce the law.

6. International Economic Cooperation Must Be Developed—International economic collaboration to assist all states to provide an adequate standard of living for their citizens must replace the present economic monopoly and exploitation of natural resources by privileged groups and states.

7. A Just Social Order Within Each State Must Be Achieved—Since the harmony and well-being of the world community are intimately bound up with the internal equilibrium and social order of the individual states, steps must be taken to provide for the security of the family, the collaboration of all groups and classes in the interest of the common good, a standard of living adequate for self-development and family life, decent conditions of work, and participation by labor in decisions affecting its welfare.

Granted that adequate preparedness calls for the retention of armed force until international organization and sanctions can be set up, we must look more deeply to the secret of our best defense. The forces inimical to our institutions and way of life will not launch their assault upon us by direct invasion. In our day propaganda precedes bombers and battleships. Any enemy seeking to overcome us would begin by an infiltration of ideas inimical to our American system and designed to undermine it. And how does a people protect itself against the bombardment of ideas and "isms"? Certainly not by forts and aircraft. We can no more fence our nation against hostile ideas than we can fence a garden against weeds. If my neighbor's garden is a weed patch from which seeds blow over into my plot, the only way I can protect my garden against the infiltration of his weeds is by cultivation. So is it with our national culture. If we wish to preserve our American way of life from the "isms" of fascist or communist states, we shall do so only by cultivating our democratic ideals and institutions.

America must work side by side with Russia in shaping the post-war world. To talk of a future war with Russia is pernicious. To start a competitive armament race with Russia would be to launch on a bankrupting program. The intelligent policy for us is to cultivate an enthusiasm for our way of life commensurate with the zeal of Russians for theirs. If we can make democracy work effectively, if we can impart to our youth a sense of mission, if we can engender in our citizenry an enthusiastic devotion to our institutions, we need not fear the infiltration of communist ideas or the invasion of Soviet legions.

The best preparedness of our nation or of any nation is the morale and resourcefulness of its people. Maginot lines are rendered useless by mobile warfare. The bombers of today

will be outmoded tomorrow. The efficiency expectancy of a battleship is hardly more than a decade. But a self-reliant and resourceful citizenry, healthy in body, clear in thought, clean in morals, articulated into efficient community action, undergirded by a sound faith in its future—such a body of citizens is a nation's best bulwark of defense.

#### IV. ENLISTMENT

The word "enlistment," like patriotism, propaganda, and preparedness, has a military connotation. It conjures up the sight of uniforms and the sound of marching men. In war we make individual participation so concrete that it comes home to the least and last citizen. Everyone is made to feel that he can do something—buy a bond, save sugar, conserve gasoline, take on an extra responsibility. But to speak of enlisting in the cause of peace sounds like an airy generalization. Peace-making is so nebulous that the individual asks with a shrug of his shoulders, "What can I do about it?" Hence in war we put our shoulders to the wheel; and then when peace comes we only shrug our shoulders.

Thus peacemaking stays in the discussion stage, divorced from action. At Harvard the story is told of President Eliot that, on one occasion following a fervent sermon by Phillips Brooks, he joined heartily in singing the old evangelistic hymn:

Am I a soldier of the cross,  
A follower of the Lamb?  
And shall I fear to own his cause  
Or blush to speak his name?

Someone seeing the reserved and normally cold President singing those words, asked Phillips Brooks later if it meant that Doctor Eliot had become evangelical. "Oh, no," was the reply, "he was just asking for information."

Similarly we go on singing the hymn of peace and discussing the phases of peace, without enlisting in the campaign for it. We keep on asking for information.

It is futile to continue asking for truth unless we are willing to follow the truth when we see it. For this reason the Master Teacher did not attempt to give an adequate answer to Pilate when in the courtroom the latter asked him, "What is truth?" Jesus simply told him, "He that is of the truth heareth my voice." It was useless to explain his secret to a man who had not the courage to obey it. The Master's principle of discipleship was that self-commitment must accompany the search for truth." Take my yoke upon you and learn of me."

If this sounds arbitrary and mentally stultifying, we might put alongside it the statement of Professor Harry Overstreet made in 1926 at the International Congress of Philosophers, meeting at Harvard University. He indicted contemporary education as producing "misers in knowledge," mere accumulations of facts, who thereby accentuated their normal self-centeredness and appropriativeness. In contrast to these, he pointed out that great scientists literally sink themselves into the objects of their studies. Said Overstreet: "The desirable kind of knowledge presupposes a kind of love of the object. That, of course, sounds like the completest kind of nonsense. When we enter a schoolroom or a laboratory we are supposed to leave our emotional, our love nature behind. But this may mean that our schools and laboratories admit only our part selves, perhaps even less than that. And part selves can hardly be expected to attain whole views. . . . Human beings have apparently to learn the almost totally unknown art of identifying-themselves-with." Thus a contemporary philosopher parallels the principle of the Master Teacher that we learn the truth by enlisting with it.

To hear without doing is worse than futile. It is disintegrating. To go on getting glimpses of challenging goals and feeling the urge of good impulses without translating them into action undermines character. That is why Matthew's gospel ends the account of the Sermon on the Mount with the warning: "Everyone that heareth these sayings of mine and doeth them not shall be likened unto a foolish man which built his house upon the sand." The foundations of character disintegrate when we go on hearing without doing. This is a point of danger for our day. Through the radio, the press, the motion pictures, and the stage we hear and see the needs and challenges of the whole world. We are made spectators of so much suffering that we grow callous to it. Ours can easily become the shallowing emotionalism of the habitual theater-goer. Many are already weary of hearing about post-war reconstruction although they have as yet done nothing about it. Tired of it all, the temptation will be to try to forget it all in a return to self-interest and self-indulgence.

Unless we Americans enlist in the preparations for peace now and in the establishing of peacemaking institutions promptly after the war, we shall see our moral fibre disintegrating. The revelations and the challenges of this time will leave us immeasurably better or immeasurably worse. It is a time for greatness. Taken at its flood, it will lead on to fortune. Allowed to pass, it will leave the future bound in shallows and in miseries.

The war has made us aware of the price paid to preserve our American way of life. Shall we continue to take these privileges for granted and use them for our self-indulgence? Or shall we dedicate ourselves to the high duty of safeguarding this America from any influences which would waste it—from any exploitation of the land which leaves it poorer, from any intolerance which divides our citizens, from any injus-

tices which oppress the poor, from subversive doctrines which undermine our democratic principles, from godlessness which would debase our institutions and demean our people? And, be it repeatedly stressed, such dedication must manifest itself in our most intimate personal circles, in our homes, among our friends, at school and office. Each day offers some opportunity for enlisting in the campaign of Christian Americanism. In the daily doing of the duties next to us we find the squad drill which fits us to move up to the front line attack on the complex problems of racial brotherhood, industrial justice, and international peace.

Every day's news brings us glimpses of greatness, flashes of heroism, examples of human endurance which we hardly thought possible. These revelations of bravery and sacrifice are like the lightning flashes in a storm. They reveal the greatness resident in men. And our challenge is to live up to the potentialities which our brave men are showing. Ben Franklin discovered electricity in a thunderstorm. Can we take these lightning flashes of heroism and harness them into the power needed for post-war peace work that the days after the war may also prove a time for greatness.

It was this rich full life which our Founding Fathers had in mind when they wrote about the "right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." They were not like Napoleon who scornfully dismissed the thought of the many lives destroyed in his campaigns by saying that one can't make an omelet without scrambling some eggs. In America, human lives are not mere pawns of the state. The state, like the Sabbath, is made for man; and not man for the state. Life along the Mississippi and the St. Lawrence is precious in the sight of God and the government.

A few Sundays ago I broadcast the National Radio Pulpit message from St. Louis. The sermon was on the subject of



hope. Within two hours after the broadcast was finished, a telegram was telephoned to the church where I was speaking. It was a message from Miami, Florida, asking me to interview a distinguished surgeon in St. Louis to find out the possibilities of treating a young man classified 4-F. A surgeon in one of the great hospitals of that city was a specialist in treating the particular ailment afflicting that young man. As I received that message I could not help but think what a marvelous civilization we have developed, wherein the radio, the telegraph the telephone, the hospital, and the church could all put their facilities to the treatment of a single sick person. That is truly a Christian civilization.

Of course, the insane irony of it all is that at the very time our marvelous inventions can thus be given to healing sick men, the nations are devoting their main business to killing off the strong men. But the point is that by stressing these humane efforts we shall eventually help to stop the inhumanity of war. It is for a land where life is so precious that our best science is put at the service of the lowliest, it is for a way of life in which men are treated as ends in themselves and not as the tools of tyrants—it is for this that our men are today risking their lives.

Would it not be tragic if after such a price had been paid we should treat life as something cheap, as something to be spent for selfish indulgence? Let us see the sacredness which derives from the sacrifices of others.

As with the right to life so it is with the right to liberty. To us in America liberty is as common as sunlight. We take it for granted. And, like sunlight, liberty does not reveal its component elements until it passes through a resisting substance. Then, as sunlight is broken up into its prismatic colors, so liberty is broken up into its component parts, such as freedom of thought, freedom of conscience, freedom of

worship, freedom to work, freedom of choice in marriage, in government, in daily decisions.

We take these liberties as a matter of course without stopping to think. But the people in Norway and Denmark, in France and Poland, look longingly across to these free lands of North America. They appreciate our liberties. And the boys at Anzio and in the South Seas, the boys in the barracks of armed camps, they are looking toward those liberties, with a new appreciation. These are the rights our fellow Americans are risking their lives for.

Now, suppose that after all this sacrifice we treat these liberties cheaply. Suppose that we treat our liberty as mere license for self-indulgence, forgetting what Montesquieu said, "Liberty does not consist in doing what one pleases. . . . Liberty can only consist in being able to do what one ought to do." Or suppose that after brave men have died to guarantee our right to freedom of thought we do not take the trouble to think for ourselves, but remain prisoners of prejudice and false rumors. Or suppose that after we have been protected in our freedom of conscience we do not take the pains to be conscientious in our daily lives and civic duties. Or suppose that after all the price paid to preserve our freedom of speech, we do not speak out when we see things that should be denounced or truth that should be proclaimed. Or suppose that after all the blood which has been shed to give us freedom of worship, we leave our churches empty and our altars unused. These liberties have been bought with a price. But if we do not treat them as precious, if we do not preserve them by exercising them, then they will not survive and we are not fit to survive.

"The right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." The pursuit of happiness! The boys in the foxholes and the bombers, the men in the submarines and the hospitals, they are longing for the days of peace, when they can take up the

work they like and go out with the girls of their choice and play with their children and roam at will through open fields and forests. The pursuit of happiness! What shall we make of it—something cheap and vulgar and artificial, or something real and genuine and creative?

In the motion picture "Madame Curie" there is a scene which should bid us pause. After the failure of the four hundred and eighty-seventh experiment in the search for radium, Pierre Curie strides across the floor crying in despair: "It can't be done. It can't be done. Maybe in a hundred years it can be done but never in our lifetime." But Madame Curie replies, "If it takes a hundred years it will be a pity, but I dare not do less than work for it so long as I have life." Such was the spirit which at last discovered radium. Such is the spirit which will bring in the better world for which brave men are now risking their lives.

A few months ago a fine young American minister, the Reverend Theodore Hume, lost his life on a plane flying from England to Sweden on a mission of peace for the World Council of Churches. His plane was shot down by the Germans. Recently his father told me, "We now know what Theodore's last words were before he left the ground in England for his fatal flight." He said, "There is in America a Swedish minister who flew to Britain from Sweden on the plane which our son was to take from England to Sweden. As he landed at the British airport and met our son, he said, 'You better not take this plane. The Germans are laying for it. It's dangerous.' But young Mr. Hume straightened up and answered, 'But I am on a mission.'"

There spoke a man who had the same sense of mission and the same spirit of discipline for peace as for war. In such citizenry lies the hope of peace.

RALPH W. SOCKMAN.









